Claims 21-39 have been rejected.

Claims 21-26, 28-35, 37-39 have been amended, as set forth herein.

I. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 21-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Panarello (US 6,289,370) in view of Shuman (US 6,236,644). The rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicant notes the prior 103 rejection based on Antur and Wallent has been withdrawn.

In ex parte examination of patent applications, the Patent Office bears the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness. MPEP § 2142; In re Fritch, 972 F.2d 1260, 1262, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The initial burden of establishing a prima facie basis to deny patentability to a claimed invention is always upon the Patent Office. MPEP § 2142; In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992); In re Piasecki, 745 F.2d 1468, 1472, 223 U.S.P.Q. 785, 788 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Only when a prima facie case of obviousness is established does the burden shift to the applicant to produce evidence of nonobviousness. MPEP § 2142; In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992); In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 1532, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993). If the Patent Office does not produce a prima facie case of unpatentability, then without more the applicant is entitled to grant of a patent. In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992); In re Grabiak, 769 F.2d 729, 733, 226 U.S.P.Q. 870, 873 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

A prima facie case of obviousness is established when the teachings of the prior art itself suggest the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art. In re Bell, 991 F.2d 781, 783, 26 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993). To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable

expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed invention and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. MPEP § 2142. In making a rejection, the examiner is expected to make the factual determinations set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17, 148 USPQ 459, 467 (1966), *viz.*, (1) the scope and content of the prior art; (2) the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue; and (3) the level of ordinary skill in the art. In addition to these factual determinations, the examiner must also provide "some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness." (*In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988, 78 USPQ2d 1329, 1336 (Fed. Cir 2006) (cited with approval in *KSR Int'l v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1741, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007)).

Claims 21-28

Independent Claim 21 has been amended to recite: providing a graphical user interface configured to display a list of switches, and for one of the switches, a menu of links, each link for accessing, via the internet, a web-page generated by a web-server associated with the switch offering virtual private network functions. Support of these elements/features may be found in the Specification, page 19, line 19 through page 20, line 20; Figure 32.

Applicants respectfully submit that Panarello fails to disclose a GUI for displaying a list of switches and, for one of the switches, a menu of links, with each link for accessing a web-page generated by a web server associated with the switch.

Applicants agree that Panarello discloses a GUI allowing a user to download a web-page of data from a switch. Panarello, Col. 4, lines 11-30. However, the GUI in Panarello does not display a list of switches or a menu of links associated with one of the switches, where each link is operable for accessing a web-page of the switch. Referring to Figures 10-12, there is no disclosure of the GUI listing multiple switches and multiple links per switch—with each link corresponding to a particular web-page. See, Panarello, Figure 10-12. In fact, Panarello teaches that a user inputs a single URL associated with a single switch in order to obtain a page of data from the switch. Panarello describes